1	DANIEL G. BOGDEN				
	United States Attorney				
2					
	Assistant United States Attorney				
3					
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101				
4					
_	Fax: (702) 388-6698				
5					
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
0					
7	-oOo-				
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) Case No. 2:12-cr-00237-APG-CWH				
9					
	) <u>Hearing</u>				
10	VS.				
	DEDLA DAMIDEZ				
11	PERLA RAMIREZ,				
12	Defendant.				
12	)				
13					
13	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between DANIEL G.				
14	BOGDEN, United States Attorney, and CRISTINA D. SILVA, Assistant United S	tates			
	BOODEN, United States Attorney, and CRISTINA D. SILVA, Assistant United States				
15	Attorney, counsel for the United States of America, and MICHAEL KIMBRELL, Esq., counsel				
1.0	for defendant PERI A RAMIREZ that the hearing on the defendant's supervised re	leace			
16	for defendant PERLA RAMIREZ, that the hearing on the defendant's supervised release				
17	violation in the above-captioned matter, currently scheduled for August 5, 2015, at 10:30	) am,			
1 /					
18	be vacated and continued for ten (10) days, to a date and time to be set by this Hono	rabie			
	Court.				
19					
	This stipulation is entered into for the following reasons:				
20	1. The Government intends on filing a motion that will impact	Ms			
	1. The Government intends on ming a motion that win impact	1415.			
21	Ramirez's status as a material witness. Additional time is needed for the Government to file				
22	that motion and for the Court to consider the motion. The motion may impact the defendant?				
22	that motion and for the Court to consider the motion. The motion may impact the defendant's				
23	resolution of her alleged supervised release violations.				

1

23

24

1	2.	The parties an	d the United State	es Probation Office anticipate agreeing to	
2	a recommendation for a revocation of the defendant's supervised release.				
3	3.	The parties ag	ree to the brief co	ntinuance.	
4	4.	The defendant	is incarcerated an	nd does not object to the continuance.	
5	5.	Additionally,	denial of this re	equest for continuance could result in a	
6	miscarriage of justice.				
	6.	The additiona	l time requested h	nerein is not sought for purposes of delay	
7	but allow for a possible resolution to the defendant's material witness hold, which may impact				
8	the resolution of the	e instant matter.			
9	DA	ΓED this 4 <sup>th</sup> day α	of August, 2015.		
10				Respectfully submitted, DANIEL G. BOGDEN	
11				United States Attorney	
12					
13	//s//			<u>//s//</u>	
14	MICHAEL KIMBI Counsel for Defend	lant		CRISTINA D. SILVA Assistant United States Attorney	
15	PERLA RAMIREZ	Z			
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
~					

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA -0Oo-

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) Case No. 2:12-cr-00237-APG-CWH
Plaintiff,	) ) <b>ORDER</b>
	)
vs.	)
	)
PERLA RAMIREZ,	)
	)
Defendant.	

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

- 1. The Government intends on filing a motion that will impact Ms. Ramirez's status as a material witness. Additional time is needed for the Government to file that motion and for the Court to consider the motion. The motion may impact the defendant's resolution of her alleged supervised release violations.
- 2. The parties and the United States Probation Office anticipate agreeing to a recommendation for a revocation of the defendant's supervised release.
  - 3. The parties agree to the brief continuance.
  - 4. The defendant is incarcerated and does not object to the continuance.
- 5. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.
- 6. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but allow for a possible resolution to the defendant's material witness hold, which may impact the resolution of the instant matter.
- 7. This is the <u>first</u> request to continue the hearing regarding revocation of supervised release date filed herein.

1

2

For all of the above-stated reasons, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance of the revocation hearing.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW** 

interest of the public and the defendant, since the failure to grant said continuance would be

likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, would deny the parties herein sufficient time and the

opportunity within which to be able to effectively and thoroughly prepare for the hearing, as

well as possibly resolve the alleged violations of supervised release, taking into account the

The ends of justice served by granting said continuance outweigh the best

3

4

5

6

7

8

exercise of due diligence.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

**ORDER** 

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the revocation hearing currently scheduled for August 5, 2015, at the hour of 10:30 am, be vacated and continued to August 19, 2015 at the hour of 10:30 am.

DATED 5th day of August, 2015.

HONORABLE ANDREW P. GORDON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE